

**IN THE DRAWINGS:**

Submitted herewith for approval by the examiner is one  
Replacement Sheet of drawings.

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office action dated October 12, 2005, and the references cited therein have been received and carefully reviewed.

As a result of the Office action, claims 3-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. Moreover, claims 4-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Rose. And claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rose in view Bakker. These references have been carefully reviewed but are not believed to show or suggest Applicant's invention as now claimed in any manner. Reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims is therefore respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

In order to overcome the Section 112, first paragraph rejections, Applicant has amended the specification to include the description of the slits, and further clarify the recitation of the second end of the shank. Support for this amendment is found in, for example, the drawing Figure 3, and no new matter is believed to have been added by this amendment. Moreover, Figure 3 has been amended to add the

reference numerals 61 and 63 to identify the slits and the second end of the shank, respectively.

Moreover, claim 5 has been amended to clarify the deviation angle of the blade as the angle between the radius of the disc where it intersects the blade and the blade itself. No new matter is added.

Furthermore, claim 6 has been amended to further clarify the claimed invention and to clearly distinguish the claimed invention from Rose. Claim 6 now recites that the second end 63 of the shank extends through the central bore of the disc so that the second end is at the same level as the lower surface of the disc. That is, stated somewhat differently, the second end of the shank becomes flush with the lower surface of the disc and does not contact any other structure or part of the stirrer, as clearly illustrated by in Figure 4.

However, Rose teaches a water lifting device or a water pump wherein the lower end of the shaft 22 is reduced to form a journal pin 23, and the shoulder 24 formed between the journal pin and the shaft rests against the upper face of the lower bearing bracket 9 to prevent downward movement of the shaft. Clearly, the second end of shaft 22 is not free and has to be in contact with the bearing bracket 9. Moreover, any modification of that structure will render the device

inoperable. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 6 is patentably distinguishable over Rose.

Claims 3-5 are dependent from claim 6 and are therefore allowable for the same reasons as claim 6.

The prior art references made of record by the examiner have each been considered but are not believed to obviate against the allowability of the newly added claim. It is noted that none of these references have been specifically applied by the examiner against any of the original claims.

Each issue raised in the Office action dated October 12, 2005, has been addressed and it is believed that claims 3-6 are in condition for allowance. Wherefore, Applicant respectfully requests a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,  
DENNISON, SCHULTZ,  
DOUGHERTY & MACDONALD

By: 

Amir H. Behnia  
Reg. No. 50,215  
(703) 837-9600 Ext. 16

Date: 2/13/06